

Lafayette R. Willis, Hitterdal.
Henry B. Young, Holt.
Oswald H. Jacobson, Rothsay.
Frank W. Hanson, Rush City.
Arnold C. Klug, Zumbrota.

MISSOURI

Ira E. Knight, Conway.
Bert G. Bottorff, New London.

MONTANA

Myrtle H. Keselring, Sunburst.

NEBRASKA

Eugene V. Hickok, Atkinson.

NEVADA

Katie O'Connor, Virginia City.

NEW MEXICO

Hilario A. Delgado, Sante Fe.

NEW YORK

Kenneth C. Steblen, Cape Vincent.
Alice C. Lewis, Gilboa.

OREGON

Theresa Scott, Jordan Valley.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jennie S. Curren, Gordon.
Russell J. Horne, Marianna.
Bertha N. Stiner, Moylan.
Spencer M. Lloyd, Republic.

PORTO RICO

Jose R. Sotomayor, Barceloneta.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John G. Jones, Allendale.
Mack M. Stewart, Winnsboro.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Julius S. Clevan, Brookings.
Irene Olsen, Eureka.

TEXAS

Claude Jones, Brownfield.
John C. Ray, Hutto.
Alexander P. Hicks, Taylor.

WASHINGTON

William A. Coates, South Washington.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, February 9, 1929

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

With Thee, our Heavenly Father, as our ever-present help, the fine fidelities of service shall prevail. Thy sovereignty takes up all human choices and deeds and shapes them into Thy eternal purpose. Oh, bless us with a nobler self-hood, enriched from Thy infinite fullness. Not less of life, but life that is more abundant, for this we ask. Stay with us in famine and in plenty, in sickness and in health. Fortify us with Thy wisdom, stimulate us with Thy love, then we shall rejoice and triumph in Thee. Thy mercy is no desert stream that loses itself in the sands, but it widens and deepens in the breadth of the vastness of the infinite ocean. Glory be to Thee, O Lord, Most High. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 14479. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Maysville, Ky., and Aberdeen, Ohio; and

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution amending section 6 of the House concurrent resolution establishing the United States Yorktown Sesquicentennial Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 15712. An act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes,

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 349) entitled "An act to supplement the naturalization laws, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. REED of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CORP- LAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ELECTORAL VOTES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication from the Secretary of State:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, February 5, 1929.

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Sir: According to the provisions of section 2 of the act approved May 29, 1928, the Secretary of State of the United States shall receive from each State two certificates relating to the presidential election. One certificate is that of the final ascertainment of electors of President and Vice President. The other certificate is that of the electors themselves and the law provides that to that certificate there shall be attached a copy of the certificate of the final ascertainment of electors of President and Vice President.

Your attention is called to the fact that the State of Mississippi, although it has sent in the second certificate, together with a copy of the first certificate properly certified by the governor, has not transmitted a separate certificate of the final ascertainment of electors for President and Vice President as provided by the act.

For your information there is inclosed a photostat copy of the certificate of final ascertainment of President and Vice President which was appended to the certificate of the electors as described above. It may be added that the department, under date of January 22, 1929, called the attention of the Governor of Mississippi to the fact that the certificate of final ascertainment had not been received by the department, but no reply has yet been received to this communication.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

FRANK B. KELLOGG.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF THE COMMISSIONED AND ENLISTED PERSONNEL OF THE ARMY, NAVY, ETC.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 12032, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to readjust the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service," approved June 10, 1922, as amended, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House bill 12032, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the amendment. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

RELIEF OF THOMAS W. MOORE

Mr. MORIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 13097, a bill for the relief of Thomas W. Moore, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House bill 13097, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the same. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

COMPACTS OR AGREEMENTS BETWEEN VARIOUS STATES

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House bill 6496, granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of New Mexico and Oklahoma with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Cimarron River and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested; House bill 6497, granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Rio Grande, Pecos, and Canadian or Red Rivers, and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested; House bill 6499, granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of New Mexico and Arizona with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Gila and San Francisco Rivers and all other

streams in which such States are jointly interested; House bill 7024, granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Colorado and New Mexico with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Rio Grande, San Juan, and Las Animas Rivers, and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested; House bill 7025, granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Colorado, Oklahoma, and Kansas with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Arkansas River and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested, and disagree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first bill, with the Senate amendment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is it not proper to call up these bills one at a time?

The SPEAKER. They will be reported to the House one at a time. The Clerk will report House bill 6496, with the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, which I do not intend to do, as I understand it the gentleman's request is only to disagree to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman from Idaho is that the Senate amendment be disagreed to. Is there objection?

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is there anything here which pertains to the Columbia River Basin project?

Mr. SMITH. Nothing at all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was disagreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill, H. R. 6497, with the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that the gentleman is taking this course by direction of the committee?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; by direction of the committee.

Mr. GARBER. What is the effect of the Senate amendment?

Mr. SMITH. The Senate amendment provides that the officer to represent the Federal Government in connection with these deliberations with the State commissions shall be appointed without limitations, while the House bill provides that the representative shall be appointed from the Department of the Interior. We think some one could be detailed from the Department of the Interior and thus save the expense of having an individual from private life as could be done under the Senate amendment.

Mr. GARBER. The gentleman is now acquiescing in the Senate amendment, is he not?

Mr. SMITH. No; we are disagreeing to the Senate amendment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What is the purpose of the gentleman's strategy in disagreeing and not asking for a conference?

Mr. SMITH. In order to give the Senate an opportunity to reconsider and recede without a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was disagreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill (H. R. 6499).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was disagreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill (H. R. 7024).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was disagreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill (H. R. 7025).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was disagreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE FRENCH BROAD RIVER

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 5301) granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the French Broad River on Tennessee Highway No. 9 in Cocke County, Tenn., a similar House bill, H. R. 16218, having been reported and now being on the calendar.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that a similar House bill has been reported?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; a similar House bill has been reported and is now on the calendar.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct, maintain, and operate a free bridge and the approaches thereto across the French Broad River, near Bridgeport, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, on Tennessee Highway No. 9 in Cocke County, in the State of Tennessee, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MONONGAHELA RIVER

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 5377) granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Monongahela River, a similar House bill being on the calendar.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge and approaches thereto across the Monongahela River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at Charleroi, county of Washington, State of Pennsylvania, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to the Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Co., its successors and assigns; and any corporation to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation.

Sec. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS LAKE CHAMPLAIN

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 4560) authorizing Elisha N. Goodsell, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Lake Champlain between a point at or near Rouses Point, N. Y., and a point at or near Alburgh, Vt., a similar House bill being on the calendar.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, Elisha N. Goodsell, of Alburgh, Vt., his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, be, and he is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across Lake Champlain, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Rouses Point, N. Y., to a point at or near Alburgh, Vt., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

Sec. 2. There is hereby conferred upon Elisha N. Goodsell, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter

upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The said Elisha N. Goodsell, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns are hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. After the completion of such bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of New York, the State of Vermont, any public agency or political subdivision of either of such States within or adjoining which any part of such bridge is located, or any two or more of them jointly, may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches and any interest in real property necessary therefor, by purchase or condemnation or expropriation, in accordance with the laws of either of such States governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation or expropriation. If at any time after the expiration of 20 years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation or expropriation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value; (2) the actual cost of acquiring such interests in real property; (3) actual financing and promotion costs, not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interests in real property; and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

SEC. 5. If such bridge shall at any time be taken over or acquired by the States or public agencies or political subdivisions thereof, or by either of them, as provided in section 4 of this act, and if tolls are thereafter charged for the use thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from date of acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 6. Elisha N. Goodsell, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, shall within 90 days after the completion of such bridge file with the Secretary of War and with the Highway Departments of the States of New York and Vermont a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches, the actual cost of acquiring any interest in real property necessary therefor, and the actual financing and promotion costs. The Secretary of War, may and upon request of the highway department of either of such States shall, at any time within three years after the completion of such bridge, investigate such costs and determine the accuracy and the reasonableness of the costs alleged in the statement of costs so filed, and shall make a finding of the actual and reasonable cost of constructing, financing, and promoting such bridge; for the purpose of such investigation the said Elisha N. Goodsell, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, shall make available all his records in connection with the construction, financing, and promotion thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to the reasonable costs of the construction, financing, and promotion of the bridge shall be conclusive for the purposes mentioned in section 4 of this act, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

SEC. 7. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to Elisha N. Goodsell, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, and any corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

SEC. 8. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

PENSIONS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 16878) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and so forth, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, may be taken from the Speakers' table and considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

This is an omnibus pension bill that should have been considered yesterday, under the rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 16878, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill.

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to said committee:

H. R. 5915. Mary R. Welsh.	H. R. 15433. Kate Thomas.
H. R. 8817. Fannie A. Struhs.	H. R. 15511. Margaret C. Donovan.
H. R. 9526. Samuel A. Kersey.	H. R. 15531. Ellen Noonan.
H. R. 10719. Louisa E. Prall.	H. R. 15600. Lena Jenkins.
H. R. 12494. William H. Revelle.	H. R. 15630. Minnie V. Stahl.
H. R. 12561. Margaret E. Hayes.	H. R. 15644. Carola M. Tonry.
H. R. 12713. Ida C. Watson.	H. R. 15691. Mary R. Gehlbach.
H. R. 12747. Mary J. Thomas.	H. R. 15750. Clara E. Moor.
H. R. 12825. Sarah Stanfield.	H. R. 15751. Anna Steele.
H. R. 12847. Mary C. Judson.	H. R. 15794. Ellis B. McNeeley.
H. R. 13672. Caroline Ryder.	H. R. 15812. George Curry.
H. R. 13681. Mary Peterson.	H. R. 15819. Peter F. Van Auker.
H. R. 14142. Fred Koeckritz.	H. R. 15844. Rachel L. Morris.
H. R. 14236. Frank B. McCartney.	H. R. 15872. Johanna Moss.
H. R. 14378. Rose Z. Cote.	H. R. 15899. Sarah A. Byam.
H. R. 14386. Sarah R. Atwood.	H. R. 15907. Charles R. Reist.
H. R. 14396. Clinton A. Short.	H. R. 15910. Margaret Harrold.
H. R. 14490. Elizabeth A. Wilkin-	H. R. 15959. Lizzie Gullett.
son.	H. R. 16105. Nancy M. Oglesby.
H. R. 14515. George E. Jones.	H. R. 16156. James Thompson.
H. R. 14559. Sam H. Wilkinson.	H. R. 16260. Thomas Waters.
H. R. 14702. John F. Halpin.	H. R. 16261. Minnie Yearout.
H. R. 14836. Morrow B. Wilson.	H. R. 16294. William E. Dollard.
H. R. 14885. Clarence Dehart.	H. R. 16326. Maggie L. Gibson.
H. R. 15030. John Stoll.	H. R. 16335. William W. Cook.
H. R. 15097. Emma P. Ripley.	H. R. 16411. Mary H. Goldberger.
H. R. 15129. Catherine Krips.	H. R. 16415. Mary Dunn.
H. R. 15237. Urtilla N. Schroeder.	H. R. 16493. Robert J. Edwards.
H. R. 15283. Emma C. Bragg.	H. R. 16552. Martha A. Osborne.
H. R. 15302. Americus Watt.	H. R. 16667. Samuel Round.
H. R. 15411. Edward G. Murton.	H. R. 16684. Mary C. Brown.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF FARMERS IN STORM AND FLOOD STRICKEN AREAS, SOUTHEASTERN UNITED STATES

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I submit a privileged report on the resolution H. Res. 312 for printing in the RECORD.

The resolution is as follows:

House Resolution 312

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 182, for the relief of farmers in the storm and flood stricken areas of southeastern United States. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the Senate joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by those favoring and opposing the Senate joint resolution, the Senate joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the Senate joint resolution for amendment, the committee shall arise and report the Senate joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the Senate joint resolution and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The resolution was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report upon the bill (H. R. 15386) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

SANCTUARIES FOR THE PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up a privileged report from the Committee on Rules, House Resolution 307.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

House Resolution 307

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 1271, an act to more effectively meet the obligations of the United States under the migratory bird treaty with Great Britain by lessening the dangers threatening migratory game birds from drainage and other causes, by the acquisition of areas of land and of water to furnish in perpetuity reservations for the adequate protection of such birds; and authorizing appropriations for the establishment of such areas, their maintenance and improvement, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by those favoring and opposing the bill, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall arise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the migratory bird refuge bill. This matter, in various forms, has been before Congress for some years. Everyone has recognized the urgent necessity of the Federal Government taking action that would protect the wild fowl of the United States, but in all the bills that have been reported heretofore there has appeared provisions that aroused so much opposition from various sources, that it has not been possible to get the enactment of an adequate law.

The bill we are about to consider has removed, I think almost entirely, the objectionable and controversial features which have appeared in bills presented heretofore.

This bill provides, first, for the creation of a commission known as the migratory bird conservation commission.

This commission is to be composed of the Secretary of Agriculture, who is ex-officio chairman of the commission; the Secretary of the Interior; two Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Senate; and two Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker. Associated with this commission in its duties will be the heads of the game department of the various States in matters relating to such States, or in States where they have no game department the governor, or some one authorized to act for him, will sit with the commission, taking part in the transactions of the commission applicable to those States.

This measure does not provide for public shooting, a feature there has been carried in former bills. It is a simon-pure migratory bird conservation measure. It carries an appropriation from the Federal Treasury. The license feature always carried in bills heretofore has been omitted.

The appropriation authorized in the bill for the first year ending June 30, 1930, is \$75,000; for the next year it is \$200,000; for the third year it is \$600,000; and \$1,000,000 thereafter for six years.

The \$75,000 to be expended the first year under the plan outlined to the committee by the Department of Agriculture will be to make a survey of the United States and secure options on desirable locations for the proposed sanctuaries. There will be no acquisition of land or sites under the appropriation for the first year. It will be a general survey by the Department of Agriculture to determine where such sanctuaries can properly be located.

When the entire program contemplated in the bill is completed, we will have probably something like 125 of these refuge stations throughout the country; there will be one or more in each State of the Union. These lands will be acquired after the location has been decided upon by the commission under the terms of the bill.

Mr. GARBER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARBER. Do the provisions of the bill make it compulsory to have one of these stations in each State?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Not necessarily so; I do not think that would be a wise provision. The representatives of the department said to the committee that there would be one or more in each State of the Union. Of course, they will have to be located at points where suitable locations can be secured and along the line of the travel of migratory birds.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Is it mandatory that each State shall have one of these stations?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. No; as I said, however, that would be the practical result.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. It leaves it discretionary as to whether we shall have one in Georgia or not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. That will be left to the commission, which is composed of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, two Senators, and two Representatives.

Mr. ASWELL. The location of the sanctuary would depend exclusively on the action of the legislature.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Yes; before any sanctuary can be acquired the legislature of the State in which it is being acquired will have to give its consent in a legal way.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I notice that the House committee has stricken out the Senate bill and substituted the new bill with similar language. Can the gentleman assure me that if the bill goes to conference it will not be rewritten and be brought back with the Senate bill in it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. The bill that came over from the Senate was introduced by Senator NORBECK, of South Dakota. After it had passed the Senate, certain changes seemed to be desirable, which will be explained in the course of the debate. I understand that these changes are absolutely satisfactory to the sponsors of the bill in the Senate, and was told so by Senator NORBECK. We have now substituted the Andresen bill for the Norbeck bill and are considering it as an amendment to the Senate bill, and I am assured that if the bill passes the House there will be no trouble in conference.

One of the features in this bill which appeals to me is that we are adopting a fixed and definite policy for the conservation of the wild fowl of the country. It is a long-time program. It will be 10 years, probably, before all of the sites that are necessary or desirable can be acquired, but when this is done and when these sanctuaries have been established, they are forever inviolate to the wild fowl of the country.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. HALE. To what extent, if any, does it require contribution of money by the States where locations are made?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. The States are not required to contribute in any way. This is a national policy, a national program for the conservation of the wild-fowl life of the United States, the necessary funds for which will come from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. LEAVITT. In what way could an area that is already in the ownership of the United States, so that no purchase is required, be brought under the provisions of this bill? I refer to an area not in a national forest or in a water-power withdrawal.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I think there is a provision here which will take care of that.

Mr. LEAVITT. I searched for that provision, and have not been able to satisfy my mind with regard to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I do not understand that the commission would have the power to arbitrarily take over a preserve now owned by the Government and convert it to one of these refuges.

Mr. LEAVITT. The particular thing I have in mind is an area in Montana which has been part of a reclamation withdrawal, but action has been taken to release it. I have asked that it be withheld without restoration to entry with the idea that its greatest use is probably for a migratory bird refuge. I want to know how under the provisions of this bill an area of that kind, which would not require purchase, and which might be agreed to by the State, could be brought within this system.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I think that could be done under the provisions of the bill. If the commission decided that it is a desirable location for one of these stations, and the Government already has title, it could be converted into a game preserve under the terms of this bill.

Mr. LEAVITT. And if there is any doubt about that, there would be no objection to an amendment to clarify it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I think not. I can not see where there would be. One of the big objections heretofore to a measure of this kind has been that they have all carried a

license provision whereby anyone who desires to shoot wild fowl would be required to take out a Federal license. It was the plan to finance the whole conservation scheme by a license levied on the individual citizens of the United States.

I think everyone who has given this problem, and it is a big problem, careful consideration has reached the conclusion that this is a great national problem. Whether we be sportsmen or not, we all know the inestimable value that the wild-fowl life has to agriculture and the forest interests of the country. The Committee on Agriculture of the House has unanimously reported this bill. As I said, I think it meets every valid objection that has heretofore been urged against the enactment of the conservation legislation and merits the support of the House. I think beyond doubt it has the support of the country more generally than any measure that has been presented here during my service in Congress.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. IRWIN. I notice that the provisions of the bill apply to migratory birds.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. IRWIN. The gentleman from Illinois a number of times used the term "wild game." This applies to migratory birds, and not to other game?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. It applies to migratory birds, and the fowl named in the bill are identical with those named in the treaty between the United States and Great Britain.

Mr. IRWIN. It does not apply to any other game?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. No; it applies only to the wild fowl named in the treaty between the United States and Great Britain in 1916 and in the act of 1918 putting into effect the provisions of that treaty.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Does this bill define migratory birds?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Yes; it defines them as they are defined in the treaty between the United States and Great Britain negotiated in 1916.

I reserve the remainder of my time and yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman for 10 minutes with permission to yield part of that time.

Mr. Speaker, the bills relating to this subject which have been before past Congresses have always been of such a nature as to render them, it seemed to me, fundamentally objectionable, and I have always, notwithstanding my deep sympathy with the principle of wild-life conservation, found myself unable to support those measures in the past, and, as some Members probably will recall, I have not only not supported them but have opposed with all the earnestness of which I was capable their passage in the House.

The license fee, which has been contained in the measures of the past, a provision to which I was opposed, that every hunter pay a Federal license, it seemed to me presented such an encroachment on the part of the Federal Government as that it would have created an irritation on the part of citizens that would have more than destroyed all the good that might come out of the other features of the bill. Fortunately the bill that is proposed now to consider has eliminated these objections of principle that have heretofore, to my mind, been insuperable, and I am very glad on account of my deep interest in this matter of conservation that a measure has been brought before the House to which I can give my support. [Applause.]

I yield whatever time may be remaining to me to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have not been able to reach the conviction to support these bills which have had for their purpose the conservation of bird life that have come in previous Congresses, but this bill seems to have features that will preserve the wild life of America, and the objectionable features having been eliminated I feel that I can support this measure with sincerity. I was interested a few days ago in reading the account of the dedication of the sanctuary in Florida, at which the President made a dedicatory speech, not only on account of the singing tower, but the sanctuary for the preservation of bird life which surrounded it. I think it is a great lesson and that the words uttered by the President in that dedication expressed the sentiment of the people of America to preserve our wild life, because we all appreciate that many species are becoming extinct. The school children of America have long studied bird life and have been engaged in the making of bird boxes, and nearly every community has its bird club for the purpose of preserving and carrying out the very features this bill proposes to preserve with reference to wild life. Not only is there a sentiment connected with the preservation of bird life, but the study of it is recognized in the preservation

of bird life. There is the destruction of insects and the preservation of crops wrapped up in this subject, and I think the Federal Government does well to take a lead in a bill that is a bill of real conservation, not a bill, as former ones have been, that will preserve the bird life in certain restricted areas and then permit people to go in there and slay and kill, which does not mean a sanctuary.

That means a place where wild life is to be destroyed. If we are going to have preservation with the idea of permanence, then it would not do for a bill like this to preserve the wild life just part of the time and permit the destruction of it at other times, and this bill will also permit the Federal Government to help keep the treaty that we have made with the Dominion of Canada.

No State by its statutes can preserve the life of migratory birds, because State lines mean nothing in such a case. It must be a national policy. This bill satisfies the requirements of a national policy, and as a real conservation bill it will make these places a real sanctuary for the bird life of America, and I am glad to support the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there are no other requests for time on the bill on this side.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Senate bill. Pending that, I suggest that the debate be limited to two hours, half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate bill 1271. Pending that, the gentleman asks unanimous consent that the time be equally controlled by himself and the gentleman from Louisiana, each to have control of one-half of the time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOPER] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1271, with Mr. HOOPER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1271, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1271) to more effectively meet the obligations of the United States under the migratory bird treaty with Great Britain by lessening the dangers threatening migratory game birds from drainage and other causes, by the acquisition of areas of land and of water to furnish in perpetuity reservations for the adequate protection of such birds; and authorizing appropriations for the establishment of such areas, their maintenance and improvement, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the debate is confined to two hours, to be equally divided between the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL]. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, this bill is intended to meet more effectively the obligations of the United States under the migratory bird treaty with Great Britain. The Senate bill as it came to the House carried an appropriation of \$1,000,000 annually for an indefinite time. The bill has been amended in accordance with suggestions made by the Department of Agriculture. As amended it carries \$75,000 for the first year, \$200,000 for the second year, and \$600,000 for the third year, and annually \$1,000,000 for seven years thereafter. It limits expenditures and maintenance of the reservation to 20 per cent of the amount appropriated for the first 10 years, and after that \$200,000 a year.

As has been stated, a commission is created to be known as the migratory bird conservation commission, consisting of the

Secretaries of the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Commerce, and two Members of the Senate, to be selected by the President of the Senate, and two Members of the House, to be selected by the Speaker, to consider and pass upon any project within the meaning of the act, recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture for purchase or rental, and to fix the price, and provides that no purchase or rental shall be made of any such area until it has been duly approved for purchase or rental by said commission.

By section 5 of the bill the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to purchase or rent such areas as have been approved for purchase or rental, at the price fixed by the commission, and to acquire by gift, and so forth, of areas he shall determine to be suitable.

Particular attention has been given to the question of safeguarding the rights of the States in connection with the establishment of sanctuaries. Section 2 makes the chief game official of each State or his representative or the governor of the State having no game department or his representative, a member of the commission for the purpose of considering and voting on all questions relating to acquisition of areas under the act in his State for sanctuary purposes. Section 7 provides that no area may be acquired in a State until after the State has consented by law to such acquisition. Section 8 reserves to the State jurisdiction both civil and criminal over persons upon areas acquired by the Government. Section 9 specifies that the act is not intended to interfere with the operation of the game laws of the several States, and section 17 provides that when a State shall by suitable legislation make provision for the enforcement of the Federal law and regulation on the sanctuaries it may cooperate with the Secretary of Agriculture in such enforcement.

Section 2 is amended, as stated in the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture, by striking out the words "Postmaster General" and inserting in lieu thereof the "Secretary of the Interior." The previous bill carried the licensing feature, under the cognizance of the Postmaster General. The elimination of the license feature from the bill makes the object of the legislation foreign to the interests of the Post Office Department. The Secretary of the Interior is suggested as a member of the commission in view of his responsibilities in connection with the administration of public lands.

According to present information of the department, at least 125 sanctuaries are required, one or more in each State of the Union and several in the Territory of Alaska.

Unless suitable water and marsh areas are maintained for our waterfowl for breeding and feeding grounds, these migratory birds will gradually disappear, regardless of further restrictions on hunting. Hence immediate action is vitally important.

The Secretary is not authorized to purchase or rent until it is so recommended by the commission.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to append a letter from the Chief of the Biological Survey, under date of January 21, 1929, setting forth its program for the establishment of the necessary sanctuaries along the migration routes:

JANUARY 21, 1929.

Hon. GILBERT N. HAUGEN,
Chairman Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HAUGEN: Supplementing my remarks of this morning and at the request of your committee, I submit for its consideration the following program of expenditures under the Norbeck bill (S. 1271) to establish inviolate sanctuaries for migratory birds.

As suggested in the report of this department on the measure under date of January 11, 1929, the \$75,000 proposed for the first year's expenses would be used in making a comprehensive survey of the most desirable sanctuary sites throughout the United States, and in developing a clear-cut, businesslike program for the establishment of the necessary sanctuaries along the migration routes.

The biological and physical characteristics of the various sites will be studied from the standpoint of their desirability as sanctuaries and breeding, feeding, and resting places for migratory birds, and information will be gathered on which to establish the value of the areas in question as a basis for estimating their cost. This would not only include the value of the land itself but the improvements and developments necessary to establish satisfactory sanctuaries in the various localities.

Although the department has had no funds available to make thorough field examinations in order to determine just where the Federal migratory bird sanctuaries should be established, a preliminary report has been prepared by members of the Biological Survey based upon information in its files and the conclusion reached that Federal sanctuaries are needed in at least 125 concentration areas. The list includes one or more sanctuaries in each State of the Union, as shown on the attached map, and several in the Territory of Alaska. As a result of the investi-

gations to be made during the first year, it will be determined whether these locations fit in with the program of the department for permanent sanctuaries and what additional sites should be included.

During the second year the department will proceed to secure options and acquire lands needed for the Federal sanctuaries. Practically all of the estimated amount of \$200,000 will be expended in accordance with the present plans of the department on the acquisition of lands found by the investigations made during the first year to be needed for sanctuary purposes, and which have been approved for acquisition by the commission. It is not planned to expend any of this \$200,000 in the administration of sanctuaries during this year.

During the third year under the \$600,000 appropriation we estimate that we will use 95 per cent for the acquisition of additional lands, including the construction of necessary improvements, such as dikes, ditches, dams, etc., and approximately 5 per cent for administering the areas already acquired. Subsequently and until a sufficient number of sanctuaries have been obtained to provide for the welfare of the migratory birds, it is the present plan of the department to use each year approximately 80 to 85 per cent in acquisition and improvements and not to exceed 15 to 20 per cent for the employment of protectors to administer and patrol the sanctuaries.

Definite information is lacking as to the prices at which all the desirable lands are held. Figures have been obtained, however, with respect to a limited number of areas which would indicate that land suitable for Federal sanctuaries could in many instances be secured at an average price of not to exceed \$5 per acre. The department proposes in all cases to proceed in a businesslike manner to obtain the land at the lowest possible price. In any event, no lands can be obtained under the bill except those that have been approved for purchase at prices fixed by the commission, consisting of three members of the Cabinet, two members of the House of Representatives, and two Senators.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL G. REDINGTON, *Chief.*

Mr. GARBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly.

Mr. GARBER. Are the representatives to be selected with regard to equal representation throughout the country?

Mr. HAUGEN. Two Members of the Senate are to be appointed by the President of the Senate and two Members of the House by the Speaker of the House.

Mr. GARBER. Does not the gentleman think that a fair representation throughout the country would be more satisfactory to the people, if some suggestion were made in the bill regarding the appointments?

Mr. HAUGEN. I assume that those making the appointments will take that into consideration.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. How are you going to distribute two Members of the House and two Members of the Senate all over the country?

Mr. HAUGEN. There is no hard-and-fast rule of distribution, but I assume the suggestion that they be appointed with due regard to representation would be sufficient.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. I do not see how you could get representation of all parts of the country in the appointment of two men from the House and Senate.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I want to ask the gentleman from Iowa a question.

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does this bill put any tax on the hunter?

Mr. HAUGEN. Not at all. The license feature has been eliminated from the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You do not allow hunting on these sanctuaries?

Mr. HAUGEN. Not at all.

Mr. GARBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to another question?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. GARBER. What does it do with reference to the jurisdiction over violations? They still maintain jurisdiction over all violations of the sanctuary?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; both civil and criminal.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, during the past 25 years a great deal has been said and done regarding the conservation of our natural resources. Federal and State laws have brought about the establishment of national and State forestry park areas for the conservation of our timber supply. The educational program for tree planting, scientific utilization of timber products, and protection of forest areas, is a step in the right direction which will assure future generations of adequate timber supplies, if properly continued.

Legislation has been enacted, though wholly inadequate, for the conservation of our water power, development of inland waterways, and general protection of the Nation's untold wealth in minerals, oils, and other natural resources. This program should be extended so that our God-given natural resources may be properly used and conserved for the benefit of all the people.

Many large areas of land, sparsely timbered, particularly in northern Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan, unproductive for agricultural purposes, but abundant in beauty and wild life, rushing streams and deep, clear lakes filled with gamey fish, should be set aside as the Nation's playground. To have these areas desecrated by the ruthless advance of industry would be a travesty upon the American people. This, the "last stand" of wildernesses in the Middle West, should be left in its original wild state and consecrated as a sanctuary for the sport-loving people of this country.

Federal and State Governments are carrying out programs for the conservation and propagation of fish and other game, with varying success. During the past 10 years the supply of game fish in streams has been greatly diminished, due principally to pollution of the waters by sewage and inadequate enforcement of game laws. Unless action is promptly taken to remedy these existing evils, fishing will no longer be a sport for the rank and file but will be a pastime for those with means who are able to travel long distances into the wilderness of this country and Canada. No time should be lost in conserving the fish of the country in their natural and usual habitat.

The bill now under consideration, Senate 1271, with the companion measure, H. R. 16525, commonly known as the Norbeck-Andresen game refuge bill, deals with the conservation of migratory birds. It is a necessary measure and should be enacted into law during the present session of Congress. The act fixes a national policy for conservation of migratory birds to more effectively meet the obligations of the United States under the migratory-bird treaty with Great Britain.

At the present time there are but few areas set aside as sanctuaries for migratory birds in the United States, and as a consequence during both open and closed season hundreds of thousands of birds are annually slaughtered for the lack of a safe resting and feeding haven.

The program proposed by this bill ultimately contemplates the establishment of permanent sanctuaries for migratory birds in every State in the Union and Alaska. Areas where birds may nest, feed, and rest without being molested by hunters. Inviolate sanctuaries. It has for its aim the preservation of ducks, geese, song birds, and insectivorous birds for future generations, as well as an assurance of a liberal supply of the migratory birds which may be legally taken for the hunters of to-day.

In order that the Members of the House may know as to the number of migratory birds covered by the treaty with Great Britain, I quote from Article I of the treaty, which was approved on December 8, 1916, by the representatives of the two Governments:

ARTICLE I

The high contracting powers declare that the migratory birds included in the terms of this convention shall be as follows:

1. Migratory game birds:
 - (a) Anatidae or waterfowl, including brant, wild ducks, geese, and swans.
 - (b) Gruidae or cranes, including little brown, sandhill, and whooping cranes.
 - (c) Rallidae or rails, including coots, gallinules, and sora and other rails.
 - (d) Limicolae or shorebirds, including avocets, curlew, dowitchers, godwits, knots, oyster catchers, phalaropes, plovers, sandpipers, snipe, stilts, surf birds, turnstones, willet, woodcock, and yellowlegs.
 - (e) Columbidae or pigeons, including doves and wild pigeons.
2. Migratory insectivorous birds: Bobolinks, catbirds, chickadees, cuckoos, flickers, flycatchers, grosbeaks, humming birds, kinglets, martins, meadowlarks, nighthawks or bull-bats, nut-hatches, orioles, robins, shrikes, swallows, swifts, tanagers, titmice, thrushes, vireos, warblers, wax-wings, whippoorwills, woodpeckers, and wrens, and all other perching birds which feed entirely or chiefly on insects.
3. Other migratory nongame birds: Auks, auklets, bitterns, fulmars, gannets, grebes, guillemots, gulls, herons, jaegers, loons, murrelets, petrels, puffins, shearwaters, and terns.

Such birds as the bobolinks, catbirds, humming birds, martins, meadowlarks, orioles, robins, wrens, woodpeckers, and many others are migratory birds. They live chiefly on insects and annually save the farmers of this country hundreds of millions of dollars in preventing destruction of crops by insects. The sanctuaries established under this bill will be havens for these

industrious and valuable creatures. Increasing the number of insectivorous birds in America will be of enormous financial benefit to agriculture, as well as added pleasure to the American people.

One of the most detailed estimates of the extent of damage inflicted by insects in the United States is that compiled by C. L. Metcalf and presented in the fifty-fifth annual report of the Entomological Society of Ontario in 1924. At that time the aggregate damage to staple field crops, vegetable crops, fruit, greenhouse products, livestock, as well as damage and losses brought about by insect-borne diseases, was placed at \$1,590,044,500.

This figure would be increased materially were it not for a number of factors that tend to reduce the numbers and control the activities of insect pests. Conspicuous among these agencies is the work done by beneficial insectivorous birds. An estimate of the value of this service has been made on the basis of a total bird population of the country. Bird enumerations have established the fact that two birds per acre is a fair estimate, at least for the eastern half of the United States. On parts of this area many more are present, making up in part at least for the admittedly smaller number of birds in some of the arid sections of the West. On this basis it is probable that there are 3,800,000,000 breeding birds in the United States. On their northward and return journeys additional migrating birds spend a portion of each year in this country. It has been estimated that this augmentation of our insect-eating birds is approximately a third of the resident population. We can assume, therefore, that there are at our service fully 4,500,000,000; the size of this feathered army is beyond real conception since each individual in it may destroy a hundred or even many hundreds of insects daily. How enormously difficult to realize is the total destruction of the insects and other animals taken up in their food! If we are to place the value of the annual services of these birds at the insignificantly low figure of 10 cents a piece, the American public would realize annually a saving of approximately \$450,000,000.

This estimate, of course, is an abstract one; but many local instances have come to light where the good services of birds are glaringly apparent, and in those areas the value of these feathered aids can not be doubted. A classical instance of the beneficial work effected by birds was that performed during outbreaks of the Rocky Mountain locust in the pioneer days of Utah. To-day a monument stands in Salt Lake City in commemoration of those valued services. Even in later years the Salt Lake Valley has experienced conspicuous work of insectivorous birds. More than 45 species were known to feed on the alfalfa weevil only a comparatively short time after it was introduced. In the South 66 species were known to feed on the cotton boll weevil, 98 prey on cutworms, 120 on leaf hoppers, and 168 on wire worms, all destructive pests of agriculture.

For the past six years or more the subject of conservation of migratory birds has been up for discussion before Congress and the conservationists of the country. In the past there has been more or less disagreement amongst the organizations as to the proper plan of conservation. I am now, however, happy to announce that all of the leading conservation organizations of the country are in thorough accord and most enthusiastically endorse and urge the passage of Senate bill 1271 as amended by the House Committee on Agriculture.

The National Committee on Wild Life Legislation, officially representing all of the leading wild-life conservation organizations in this country, has rendered a distinct service to the people of America in its unselfish effort to secure the passage of this legislation. The officers of the committee—Dr. T. Gilbert Pearson, of the National Association of Audubon Societies, as chairman; Carlos Avery, of the American Game Protective Association, as vice chairman; Seth E. Gordon, of the Izaak Walton League of America, as secretary; and the other members of the committee—deserve special mention for their untiring work in behalf of the conservation of migratory birds. These men are here to-day to witness the realization of a long-cherished dream.

The American Game Protective Association; the Izaak Walton League of America; the International Association of Game; the Western Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners; the National Association of Audubon Societies; the American Forestry Association; the Gopher Campfire Club, of Hutchinson, Minn.; General Federation of Women's Clubs; and other organizations and individuals are now unitedly for this bill as amended, and have given most valuable aid in bringing about national interest for the conservation of migratory birds as set forth in this bill.

Senate bill 1271, as amended, has the approval of the President, the Director of the Budget, and the Secretary of Agriculture.

The bill, as amended, clearly defines and establishes a definite policy of the Government for the conservation and protection of migratory birds. Areas of land and land and water will be acquired for inviolate sanctuaries for migratory birds in every State and in Alaska.

Section 2 provides for the creation of the migratory bird conservation commission, consisting of the Secretary of Agriculture as chairman, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, two Members of the Senate, appointed by the Vice President, and two Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker. The ranking officer of the State in which the refuge is located shall be a member ex officio of the commission, having the right to vote on all questions relating to the acquisition of areas in his State. The commission will have charge of selecting areas and establishing sanctuaries, and will serve without pay.

The administration of the act is placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture and provides for joint cooperation with the States in the enforcement of its provisions.

The bill provides for no license fee and is financed out of the Treasury, as follows: Seventy-five thousand dollars for 1930, \$200,000 for 1931, \$600,000 for 1932, and \$1,000,000 a year thereafter for seven years, after which time \$200,000 is provided annually for the administration of the refuges.

The bill specifically provides that not more than 20 per cent of each annual authorization shall be used in the administration of the sanctuaries, leaving a balance of 80 per cent for acquisition of areas of land and land and water for inviolate sanctuaries, during the 10-year program.

To make it clear: There will be no license fee and no public shooting grounds under the provisions of the bill. The areas secured will be inviolate permanent sanctuaries for migratory birds. There will be cooperation as to enforcement and selection of sanctuaries by the State and Federal Government. Enabling legislation on the part of the State will be necessary before a sanctuary is established and acquired by the Federal Government.

The areas acquired under this act will serve a threefold purpose. First, sanctuaries for migratory birds; second, spawning and feeding grounds for fish, as well as ideal fishing grounds; and third, places for propagation of fur-bearing animals, such as beaver, mink, muskrat, and so forth.

Members of the House, this bill should receive your unanimous approval, and it is my sincere hope that it will, in its amended form, be approved by the Senate, become a law, and be recognized as the outstanding achievement for conservation of the Seventieth Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. NEWTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON. The committee struck out everything after the enacting clause in the Senate bill. Some time ago I received a number of communications suggesting that the House pass the bill substantially as the Senate sent it over, but, as I understand, the committee has made some very substantial improvements in the bill as it came over.

Mr. ANDRESEN. That is correct.

Mr. NEWTON. And that now the very organizations which originally favored the bill as it came over are behind the bill as it has been reported to the House?

Mr. ANDRESEN. That is correct. Some of the amendments made in the bill were of minor character. The Postmaster General was designated in the Senate bill as a member of the commission originally. The idea was that the Postmaster General, through the post offices, should collect the license fee, but with the license fee eliminated from the bill we thought it better to have the Secretary of the Interior, who has control of the public lands, on the commission in preference to the Postmaster General. Another change made in the bill was as to the amount of money authorized. The Senate bill provided for an annual appropriation of \$1,000,000. Upon investigation we found that during the first three years the department would be unable to spend that amount of money, so instead of providing for \$1,000,000, we changed the amount to \$75,000 for the first year, \$200,000 the second year, and \$600,000 the third year.

Mr. NEWTON. This illustrates that in the indorsement of any given proposition people would do better to indorse the general principles embodied in a bill rather than to attempt to write the detailed text of the bill.

Mr. ANDRESEN. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Can the gentleman give us any idea as to how large these areas will be ultimately?

Mr. ANDRESEN. Well, areas should be established all over the United States as far as the appropriations go, and that program, as I understand it, will be carried out by the Biological

Survey. The Biological Survey will first make an investigation as to proper places to be designated as such areas.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. In other words, how large should an area be to serve as a game preserve?

Mr. ANDRESEN. We now have an area, known as the upper Mississippi wild-life refuge area, where the program ultimately contemplates the acquisition of 165,000 acres of land and water at a total cost of some one million and a half dollars. However, that is a large area and it will not be necessary to have as large areas as that under this bill.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. But it will be necessary to have quite large areas in order to serve these purposes?

Mr. ANDRESEN. Oh, that is true; they should be large enough so as to serve the purposes and they should also be in the line of flight, where the birds generally fly, and where there are proper feeding and nesting grounds for migratory birds. That will all be taken into consideration in connection with the investigation.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. The gentleman stated that certain enabling legislation or action on the part of the States would be necessary before any sanctuaries could be established in a State. Will the gentleman briefly explain what will be necessary on the part of the respective States?

Mr. ANDRESEN. It will be necessary for the State legislatures to pass enabling legislation so that the Federal Government may take over and buy the land. The governor of a State, or the administrative officer in charge of game and fish enforcement, will sit on the commission to provide for the locations within a particular State.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. LEAVITT. I asked a previous speaker under the rule a question that I should like also to put to the author of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. LEAVITT. I have not been sure in reading the bill whether it provides for a situation such as this, that there is a suitable area which belongs to the Federal Government now and which is a natural feeding ground for migratory birds. It could be made a part of this system if the Secretary of the Interior were authorized to transfer it to the Secretary of Agriculture for the purposes of the act, but I have not been sure whether in this act there is authority that would allow the Secretary of the Interior to make such a transfer.

Mr. ANDRESEN. In answer to the gentleman I might say that at the present time there are approximately 80 different kinds of sanctuaries in the country, virtually all of which have been transferred by Executive order, and I believe that under the circumstances the gentleman mentions an Executive order could be issued.

Mr. LEAVITT. There is no question but that an Executive order could be issued, but there is a question whether the Secretary of the Interior, who is to be a member of this commission, could make such a transfer without a presidential order.

Mr. ANDRESEN. I do not believe he could.

Mr. LEAVITT. Would it not be better, since this commission is authorized to acquire other lands by purchase, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make such a transfer without the delay of an Executive order?

Mr. ANDRESEN. I do not believe so, for the reason that in some of the smaller States, where there are large national-forest areas, it might be inadvisable.

Mr. LEAVITT. Those areas, of course, are exempted under the bill. What I have in mind, to be specific, is this: Within the last few months a situation has developed in Montana with respect to an area that for many years was withdrawn as a part of a reclamation project for reservoir purposes. This area naturally would be a fine wild bird sanctuary, and the question is now up as to what is to be done with these lands. I have asked the Secretary of the Interior not to restore these lands to public entry so that they can be dissipated under the homestead law or otherwise while this matter is being worked out, and I had rather hoped that this bill would authorize the Secretary, without very much machinery, to include them in this system, if the authority created in this bill should determine that that is their wisest use. I have drawn this amendment for discussion, but I do not intend to offer it if it is not entirely satisfactory to the committee, since I desire the bill to pass speedily.

Add a new section—section 20:

"The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture for all of the purposes of

this act any areas of public land determined by the agencies herein to be suitable therefor, except such areas as are specifically exempted in this act."

This, of course, would still exempt national-forest areas or areas under water-power withdrawal except under an agreement with the States, and would not include anything except a little easier machinery for building up this system of sanctuaries by including areas that we now own and would not have to buy.

Mr. ANDRESEN. I do not believe the gentleman's amendment would do any harm, but I think as long as a commission is created to pass upon the location of the land and the designation of sanctuaries it would probably be well to leave it within their discretion as to securing an Executive order rather than to give the power to the Secretary of the Interior to transfer that land.

Mr. LEAVITT. This is simply removing one step of the difficulties.

Mr. ANDRESEN. We generally have Presidents who are in sympathy with conservation.

Mr. DENISON and Mr. LAGUARDIA rose.

Mr. DENISON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota, if he will be kind enough to yield, a question about section 7. This bill, of course, is to establish a national policy and is in pursuance of a treaty with another government and proposes to establish national game refuges, and yet section 7 provides that no land shall be acquired in any State for a game refuge without the consent of the State.

If it is a matter of wise national policy to establish a game refuge why should not the Federal Government establish one in a State without the special permission of the State? What is the theory back of that provision in the bill?

Mr. ANDRESEN. The theory of that is that we might go into an individual county or section of a State where a great deal of the land—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Where a great deal of the land might be acquired by the Federal Government either under condemnation or by purchase which would take away from the county taxable lands and might create considerable difficulty. I know of counties in Minnesota where we would have that situation, and we feel that as long as the governor sits in as a member of the commission designating the area, that if the State is interested in conservation, we will not have any trouble about getting the areas.

Mr. DENISON. It seems to me if it is of sufficient national importance that the Federal Government should acquire land and establish game refuges and that it is of importance it should be done in a certain State, the Federal Government ought to have the right to do so, whether the State wants it done or not. I can not understand why this should be made subject to the approval of the State.

And may I ask the gentleman, while he has the floor, whether or not the States will have the right to tax this land?

Mr. ANDRESEN. No; the land will be owned by the Government unless it is leased.

Mr. DENISON. Of course, section 8 of the bill gives the State civil and criminal jurisdiction over it.

Mr. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman is reading section 8 of the committee amendment—

Mr. DENISON. I am reading section 8 of the committee amendment and I did not know whether that was broad enough to include the right to tax or not.

Mr. ANDRESEN. No; it is tax-exempt property.

Mr. DENISON. I would like to ask the gentleman one more question. Section 9 provides—

that nothing in this act is intended to interfere with the operation of the game laws of the several States.

So if we establish a game refuge in a particular State and if the laws of that State permit men to go on that land and hunt and destroy the birds, they can do it?

Mr. ANDRESEN. No; they can not do that, because the State law has to comply with the Federal law and if the State law is out of line the State will have to change its law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture reports that 75 per cent of all the migratory fowl in the United States and in Canada spend their winters in the sanctuaries in the southern portion of the State of Louisiana.

This bill proposes to establish resting and feeding grounds for these migratory fowl as they fly from the north to the southern sacred sanctuaries each winter and back in the spring. All of

us in that section are vitally interested in such a measure as the one proposed here.

Since the bill has been changed, the Federal license having been stricken from it and the other objectionable features removed, I have no information that there is any opposition in this Chamber to the measure. There certainly is none in the committee. There is no opposition on the floor and yet we are to discuss it for a short time.

I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE].

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, as you know, in 1916, the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada entered into a treaty for the protection of migratory birds. Shortly thereafter Congress passed an enabling act in order to protect and uphold that treaty. That act has not been sufficient for the protection of migratory birds.

Ever since I have been a member of the Agricultural Committee there has been an effort to pass some kind of a migratory bird law that would give protection to the wild-fowl life of this country and Canada; but there has always been a division in the committee and on the floor of the House when the committee reported any bill of that character. It met with opposition, and as a result there has been no legislation.

Here is a bill reported by the committee that has met the approval of every member of that committee. I have tried to study these bills since I have been a member of the committee because I am one who is absolutely interested in the protection of the wild fowl of this country and Canada. I think this is the greatest conservation measure, without any exception, that has been presented to the Congress of the United States since I have been a member of the committee.

The two major objections to the bill heretofore reported to this House were: First, the license feature, compelling every man who hunted migratory birds to procure a Federal license from his post office, and that fund to finance the buying of preserves for these wild fowl. The second was—and this was my major objection—that it gave to the Secretary of Agriculture the discretion to open these sanctuaries at intervals and let the big hunters of the country come in and have a good time, when the poor fellow at home paid a dollar for his license and did not have time nor money to go into the preserve.

Now, these two features have been eliminated by this bill. This is a representative bill; it is a democratic bill; it coordinates with State authority in the enforcement of it. First and foremost, it creates a commission composed of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, and two Members of the House, appointed by the Speaker, two Members of the Senate, appointed by the Vice President, and one representative, either at the head of a game department of the State, if the State has one, and, if not, the governor of the State, who shall be a member of this commission, with as much power as any other member of the commission on the question of buying preserves within their respective States.

It also provides that the States shall have the right to enforce any game laws so long as they do not conflict with the Federal game laws in the preserves or sanctuaries.

The biological survey of the Department of Agriculture has already given years of study to this proposition, looking to the day when Congress might pass a bill for real conservation of wild fowl life in this country and Canada. In their letter they say that they have all agreed that there are as many as 125 game preserves, and that they are so distributed that at least every State in the Union will have one. Therefore, if this bill is passed there will be 125 of these preserves.

Mr. ALMON. And each State will have at least one?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Each State will have at least one, but I do not care about that feature, because you have got to have land of a certain topographical nature in order to have the propagation of the game.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. A State would not want a preserve if they had no use for one. In other words, no State would request one if they had no use for it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Absolutely; and that is the reason for putting in that provision in order to establish a preserve the State has to agree to it. If they did not want it they need not have it.

If they do want it, we want them to come in wholeheartedly, and with all of their local forces, game wardens, and others, helping to preserve the wild fowl of America. When you have as many as 125 game preserves throughout this country made inviolate sanctuaries, so that a gun is never fired in them for any purpose, you are going to preserve the wild fowl life of this country and Canada. It does not make any difference how many million ducks, or geese, or other migratory birds go from

the North to the South in the wintertime and back again later on, unless you have some place in transit for those birds to rest and feed and nest it will not be very far in the future when you will have no wild fowl life either in this country or in the Dominion of Canada.

To me the passage of a bill like this is not only a benefit to the wild-fowl life of the country, but it is for the common weal, it is of good to everyone. The marshlands in the United States are being very rapidly, and I think distressingly so, cleared up for agricultural purposes, when there are millions of acres of agricultural lands in the country not now under cultivation. Why should not those marshlands be preserved? Why is there not conservation policy in that? If we establish these sanctuaries inviolate there will not be any trouble about the propagation of game. The wild ducks and the wild geese and the other migratory birds that make the round trip each way will find more quickly than anything else where there is a gun fired. There will be no trouble if these preserves are established under this bill, because these birds will know in a very little while where to go where no gun is ever fired. I do not know whether any of you other gentlemen have had the experience or not, but I have driven around the Speedway here in duck season and I have seen from two to five hundred wild ducks right out here in the river.

Mr. FENN. And they are there to-day.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Yes; they are there to-day; and they are there because they know if they go a little farther down the river a gun will be fired at them.

Then the bill provides for cooperation in the enforcement of the law by the various States. That I think is absolutely necessary. You can not enforce any law without the support of the local government and the sentiment of that government in favor of enforcement. If these sanctuaries are established, we say that the State must take affirmative action and say that it will cooperate, and will pass an enabling act so that we can take the territory, and we will not take any territory in any State in the Union unless that State consents to it. It is a cooperative measure not only in the acquisition of these preserves, but in the enforcement of the State laws.

In the original bill we provided for an appropriation of a million dollars a year. In this bill we start with \$75,000 for the first year for the purpose of making these surveys, and then the sum increases each year up to a million dollars in 1933, and remains at a million dollars a year until 1939, it being the opinion, of course, that in that time they will have been able to purchase all of the preserves that are necessary. After the preserves are obtained, it is the opinion of the Agricultural Department that it will take only a sum of \$200,000 a year as operating expenses in order to enforce the law in every game preserve in the United States.

If we pass the bill to-day and it goes to the Senate, we have the assurance that it will enact the bill as it is. If we pass this bill to-day, I believe that posterity will rise and call us more blessed for this vote than for any vote that has been cast here in years. [Applause.]

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE].

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to observe the transformation in the sentiment of the game associations of America with respect to this legislation as we read of their approvals of this bill. The record will show that I have been opposed to legislation on this subject as embraced in former bills. I have never opposed legislation for the preservation of game. I yield to no Member of the House in my sincerity and ardor for the preservation of game. I heretofore opposed the bills because they were not for the preservation of game, but for the establishment of public hunting grounds, public shooting grounds, thereby inexorably establishing reservations for the destruction of game and not for the preservation of game. Moreover, I did not think Congress had authority to enact such legislation, unless we did it in pursuance of our treaty with Canada, and that treaty does not provide for or contemplate public hunting grounds.

That treaty affords no basis for the passage of any measure for the destruction of game, but is a basis only for the preservation of game. I have been in receipt of some very caustic letters by reason of my attitude on these bills. I am happy to say that the authors of some of these letters and criticisms are to-day supporting this bill, based upon the identical ground which I have always heretofore taken—that the Congress has a right to legislate for the preservation of game and not for the destruction of game, no matter how the language may have been camouflaged.

I have pleasure in supporting this particular bill. It meets my views and convictions. I have on former occasions stated on this floor that I would support any reasonable bill for pres-

ervation of game, for sanctuaries for birds if the provisions for the establishment of public hunting or shooting reservations and Federal licenses were eliminated. I congratulate the committee that this elimination has been made in the pending bill, and that I am now enabled to vote my approval of a game-preservation measure.

I think we are now free of the vice which has impaired if not destroyed the merits of all former bills upon this subject, and that we have now open to us a clear way for the preservation of the migratory birds of America.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen of the House. In 1916 the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland entered into a treaty (treaty series No. 628), as shown in Senate Document 348. That treaty was to last for a period of 15 years. The names of more than 70 kinds of wild life are listed in this treaty. Twenty-nine different varieties of those birds are birds that eat insects and therefore are valuable both to production and to life. This treaty was signed by both countries and became effective on December 8, 1916.

Its terms provide for an operative period of 15 years. At the end of those 15 years, which will be 1931, if neither of the countries give 12 months' notice of their desire to be relieved of the provisions of the treaty it would be automatically extended for a period of 1 year, and thereafter from year to year until such notice may be given. Thus, so long as the two countries are satisfied with the provisions of the treaty it will automatically remain effective. If anyone desires to read or look up the names of the birds referred to here he will find it on page 2646—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman put those in his speech?

Mr. JONES. I will put the reference in the speech, and any gentleman desiring to do so can get Senate Document 628, which contains the full text of the treaty. I want to emphasize the point made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE]. The provisions of that treaty state that its purpose is for the preservation of these useful birds, and to prevent their indiscriminate slaughter. The first bill, over which we had such a fight in the House and which had both the licensing fee and the provision for public shooting grounds, purported to be a measure for the carrying out of this treaty, and yet even the most casual reading of that bill disclosed the fact that it was not essentially for the preservation of the birds, but its primary purpose was to furnish a slaughtering ground for professional hunters of the country, who, under its terms, could follow the birds from place to place until in their helplessness they would be driven frantic with fear and, of course, ultimately destroyed. But this bill in accordance with the terms of the treaty is a pure sanctuary bill. It will not in any way interfere with legitimate hunting. It is in the interest of the true sportsman, for it furnishes a haven of refuge for the wild life of the country, without in any way interfering with such shooting as the treaty permits outside the limits of the sanctuaries.

The purpose of the treaty is stated in terms as follows:

Being desirous of saving from indiscriminate slaughter and of insuring the preservation of such migratory birds as are either useful to man or harmless, the contracting parties have resolved to adopt some uniform system of protection which shall effectively accomplish such object, and to the end of concluding a convention for this purpose have appointed as their respective plenipotentiaries—

And so forth.

That states the purpose of the treaty, which treaty is signed by the two contracting governments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Under this bill hunting will not be permitted on the game reserve.

Mr. JONES. No; hunting on the game preserves under no circumstances will be allowed under the terms of this bill. The first bill provided not only for public shooting grounds but also gave the privilege, at certain periods of the year, of entering the sanctuary itself for purposes of shooting. But in this bill those features have been eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. JONES. It also forbade any man hunting on his own premises if he did not have the dollar license, which he would have to go to the post office and get, even if he shot only one time in the year.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I understand the gentleman makes the point that the measure we had here before was not really in line with the purposes of the treaty?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. One more question: Has the gentleman any information to show the results as to the multiplying of these birds under legislation heretofore enacted under the treaty?

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will secure the hearings that were had a year ago, he will find that they set out the full information gained by the Department of Agriculture on that point.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. It is contained in the report?

Mr. JONES. Yes; in the report of the Secretary of Agriculture.

This bill eliminates the license feature and the shooting-ground feature. There will be places in the future, if this measure passes, where birds going south will enter these sanctuaries and will be there protected against all character of hunting. It will be impossible then to destroy the wild life of this country. As a matter of fact, the number and value of the wild life of this country are inconceivable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. ASWELL. I yield to the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I want to ask a question. Of course, I favor this bill. The gentleman from Texas made a remark a little while ago that a man could not hunt on his own premises.

Mr. JONES. That was under the original bill. That is, he could not hunt on the premises unless he actually lived on the specific ground and had less than 160 acres. If he had a tract across the road he could not hunt on it. But this measure corrects that.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. During the shooting season this will not interfere with a man hunting on his own preserves?

Mr. JONES. No. I was speaking of the original bill. This bill before us now carries out the original treaty, both in letter and spirit, between this country and Great Britain as negotiated in 1916; and I believe that with the provisions of this bill properly carried out, that treaty will continue to be a friendly treaty relationship between our country and the British Empire, and especially the Dominion of Canada, probably for an indefinite period.

Mr. GARBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. GARBER. Is there anything in this bill that will prevent a private gun club from shooting on its own grounds?

Mr. JONES. There is nothing in the bill covering that. Of course, such shooting would be limited by the treaty. Shooting would only be allowed in season.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Ought there not to be a proviso in the bill to the effect that no reservation shall be located within a State that does not provide for that?

Mr. JONES. I think that would be a wise provision. I think, however, that probably will be taken care of in the regulations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, no further time is requested on this side.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I recognize, of course, that there is no concerted opposition to this bill, and therefore I do not purpose to take the time of the committee for any extended observations. But I thought that just a word or two by way of recollection of the debate heretofore might be of interest.

By a peculiar coincidence this measure has been before the House three different times in the month of February. The first time it was reported in the House was in February, 1923. I think you will recall the interest that was shown in that debate. The three principal features to which the fire was directed in the bill, as has already been indicated, were the licensing feature, the public shooting grounds, and the unusual control by the Federal Government. I want to set out just in a

sentence or two, to indicate the trend of the debate, the remarks made by a few Members of the House at that time.

These will only be selected sentences. In the first place, may I quote one sentence in the argument made in opposition to the 1923 form of the bill by the minority leader, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], who favors the present bill? Said he, speaking of the friends of the bill:

They fail to appreciate the fact that this is but enhancing Federal power, taking another step toward adding to the restlessness and discontent of the average citizen with the Federal Government.

I think that fairly well indicates the attitude of the gentleman from Tennessee and many of those who voted against the bill at that time.

Mr. Mondell, the majority floor leader at that time, was also opposed to the bill, and I think you will be interested in one sentence from his remarks. He said:

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to make it plain that my opposition to this legislation is because it is an extraordinary extension of Federal police power without any sound reason or excuse for such extension.

I want to refer just a moment to an expression from conservative New England. Mr. TREADWAY, of Massachusetts, said:

I think it is a very poor bill, and I wish my colleagues on the Republican side were as cordial in their indorsement of that statement as my Democratic friends are; but this is not a political matter, gentlemen. It is purely a question whether or not we are going to get down to brass tacks on the question of controlling everything in sight from a Federal Government center. I am opposed to that principle.

Governor MONTAGUE, of Virginia, has already set out his own views on the present bill, but I think as a matter of history it might be well to read one sentence from his remarks on that first bill. Said Governor MONTAGUE:

Mr. Chairman, if this were a bill for the protection of game I would vote for it cheerfully. If it were to set aside a sanctuary or refuge for these birds I would vote for it. But these are mere incidents in the bill.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. The gentleman means to refer to the remarks on the former bill and not this bill?

Mr. KETCHAM. I thought that was clear.

Mr. ASWELL. I wanted that made clear.

Mr. KETCHAM. These, of course, are remarks made in connection with the debate on the first bill that was presented. It may interest the committee to know something about the details of the vote taken on these other occasions. On the first form of the bill as presented to the House the test vote was upon a motion to strike out the enacting clause. That prevailed by a vote of 154 to 135. Subsequently the matter was brought to the attention of the House a second time under a special rule, in February, 1925, and in the form of the bill then reported a very sincere effort was made to correct many of the things complained of in the first form. So successful was the Committee on Agriculture in this effort that the bill passed the House at that time by a vote of 212 to 113.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. KETCHAM. I have found by checking the RECORD that 29 different gentlemen of the House who cast their votes in opposition to the first form of the bill voted for it upon its second presentation to the House.

Now, in the present form of the bill I think everything that has been complained of by the opponents of the bill has been met, and so far as I am aware and so far as the hearings before the committee indicate there is no opposition offered to it, and I sincerely trust that this perfected form of the bill will meet with the overwhelming approval of the House, with the understanding that if it goes to the Senate there will be a general agreement in conference and the bill in the form as we now present it, which I believe by far is the best form, will finally be enacted into law and a great forward step taken in this tremendous problem of conservation. It certainly is a pleasure to note that the present bill meets the hearty approval of the three gentlemen mentioned now in the House who so strongly opposed it in 1921.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. As I understand, the bill does not carry a license fee?

Mr. KETCHAM. It does not carry a license fee. The bill also eliminates the other very objectionable shooting-grounds

provision to which attention was called. It goes further, and, I think, works out as satisfactorily as it can be worked out this vexing question of Federal and State authority with reference to control.

Mr. GREEN. I may say to the gentleman that I have received a large number of telegrams and even more letters in support of the bill and none opposing it. Therefore I am supporting the bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, while, as has been indicated, when this bill was before the House on previous occasions there was a great deal of opposition to it, that opposition, I think, was always to the form of the bill and not to its purpose. It has been stated that by the provisions of this bill the Government embarks upon a new policy. It does not, however, do that in a broad sense. This Government has recognized for many years its obligation to conserve our wild life and to maintain refuges for our migratory birds. However, until the present time there has been no definite constructive policy in this regard. We have, I think, at the present time, some 65 or 70 bird refuges, but all of those have been acquired piecemeal and not as a result of any definite plan.

The result has been that they are not, perhaps, as useful or well located as they might otherwise be. Under this plan the Secretary of Agriculture and other members of the board will have an opportunity to make a survey of the entire country and determine the proper locations of these refuges. There are a good many things to be taken into consideration in determining these locations. Migratory birds, as you all know, have certain well-defined routes of flight and these refuges will have to be located on those routes. They will also have to be located with reference to the habits of the birds and the availability of food supplies. Their location must also be determined with reference to whether they are going to be used as feeding grounds, as nesting grounds, or resting grounds, in the course of a flight.

The Biological Survey, I am informed, has already made quite an extensive survey of the country for this purpose and they say that at the present time they have in mind at least 125 sites which it would be possible to use as migratory-bird refuges. Heretofore they have never had an appropriation which was sufficient to allow them to make a proper and thorough investigation.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I will.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. This act, as I read it, is intended to supplant the former migratory bird act?

Mr. HOPE. It is.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I have not seen anything in the act which repeals that law or any part of the law that is in conflict with this act.

Mr. HOPE. In reply to that, I will say that perhaps I misunderstood the gentleman when I said it was expected to supplant any former act. It is not expected to take the place of any former act, but it does supplant former bills which have been before this Congress but which have never been enacted into law.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. The former migratory bird bill passed by the House was not enacted by the Senate. Is that the situation? I understand we passed it in the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Yes; in 1918 we passed the migratory bird act, but this in no way repeals that act but deals with the whole subject in a practical manner. All this bill does is to provide sanctuary for these birds.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. This is just to dovetail into the other act. The other act provides for a licensing fee, as I understand.

Mr. ANDRESEN. No; I will say to the gentleman there is no license fee now charged by the Federal Government for the shooting of migratory birds and there is no law on that subject. As the gentleman stated, the purpose of this bill is to dovetail into the other act and make it a part of the general scheme of protection of migratory birds.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I do not want to further take the time of the gentleman from Kansas. His explanation makes entirely clear to me the purpose and scope of the pending bill.

Mr. HOPE. This measure, I may say, is purely supplemental to all of our previous laws either creating game refuges or for the protection of migratory birds generally. It does not attempt to repeal or modify any of our present laws on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. HOPE. I was telling of some of the work that the Biological Survey has already done in connection with establishing these refuges. It has not only made a survey for the purpose of determining where these refuges should be located, but there have been, as Members of Congress know, a number of refuges established within recent years and since the migratory bird treaty was consummated in 1916. One of these is the Upper Mississippi Refuge, another is the Bear River Marsh Refuge out in Utah; but never until the proposal of this measure have we had a definite, comprehensive program for the establishment of these sanctuaries.

Canada has far outstripped us in establishing bird sanctuaries. At the present time Canada has some 1,700 square miles which is either inviolate sanctuaries or a combination of sanctuaries and public shooting grounds. One thousand square miles of the total areas comprises inviolate sanctuaries and the remaining 700 square miles of course is a sanctuary during most of the year, although shooting is permitted during certain seasons.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit an interruption there?

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Did I understand the gentleman to say that Canada has reservations that are in part sanctuaries and in part public shooting grounds?

Mr. HOPE. My understanding is they have a total of 1,700 square miles of bird refuges and about 1,000 square miles of the area is a year-round sanctuary, but shooting is permitted on about 700 square miles of this area of refuges; that is, there are 40 of these sanctuaries which are inviolate the year round and there are 51 upon which shooting is permitted during certain seasons of the year.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. DENISON. Is it the intention of those who have originated this legislation to make these sanctuaries inviolate or to permit shooting on them?

Mr. HOPE. It is the intention of this bill, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, to make these sanctuaries inviolate.

Mr. DENISON. But the bill does not do that.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; the bill does do that.

Mr. DENISON. The bill provides that the game laws of the States shall apply, and under the laws of the States they can go in there and hunt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two more minutes.

Mr. DENISON. Section 9 of the bill reads as follows:

That nothing in this act is intended to interfere with the operation of the game laws of the several States applying to migratory game birds in so far as they do not permit what is forbidden by Federal law.

There is no Federal law preventing or prohibiting such shooting.

Mr. HOPE. This bill provides in other sections that the sanctuaries shall be inviolate.

Mr. DENISON. Then, what does the section mean that says the State game laws shall apply? What State game laws will apply?

Mr. HOPE. I take it that simply means this proposed act does not apply to State game laws as far as they affect the States outside of these sanctuaries.

Mr. DENISON. It does not say that.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. ANDRESEN. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that before the sanctuaries may be established in any State it will be necessary to have enabling legislation within that State, and that enabling legislation will provide that these areas shall be inviolate sanctuaries.

Mr. DENISON. How do we know that others will not be established?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is any doubt that under the provisions of the bill, taken as a whole, there can be established nothing but inviolate sanctuaries. If that is not clear in the bill it ought to be, but I am satisfied, so far as I am concerned, that that is included in the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. DENISON. That may be true, but I can not understand the necessity for section 9, which provides that nothing in the act shall interfere with the State game laws. I wish some Member of the House who is familiar with the terms of the bill will explain that to the House.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL].

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the migratory bird act protects migratory game birds from the dangers threatened by drainage, and other causes, by acquisition of areas of land and of water to furnish in perpetuity reservations for adequate protection of such birds.

This act, in my judgment, is one that will perpetuate the hunting for future generations more than any bill that could be passed in Congress.

Civilization and cultivation of lands and drainage of lands have taken away from large areas in the United States the sport and hunting that has existed for many years and has eliminated the opportunity of those who enjoy outdoor life, and especially hunting, to such an extent that it makes it necessary now for those that may desire to hunt to either build or cooperate with those who do build hunting preserves, thus eliminating at least 95 per cent of the population who might have opportunities if this bill is voted through the Congress of the United States and becomes a law.

I favor it for many reasons. The young boy, either from the city or the country, should have opportunities of knowing what wild life is in this country. The opportunities that were given to the earlier generations have passed and there is no way that hunting can be preserved better than by passing a migratory bird act which will establish reservations for their protection and game laws which will protect the migratory bird from destruction during the period of hatching and raising of the young birds.

I am well acquainted with a section of the country known as the Illinois-Mississippi Valley which is probably the best hunting section for migratory birds of any part of the country. Unless provisions are made for the protection and conservation of the North American birds, it will only be a few years until they will be extinct.

I favor this bill as a whole and I hope every Member of Congress will vote for it. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT].

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, as confirming what has been said by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL], I want to read a telegram from a man who resides in my district and who has, I think, done as much by his personal effort in the interest of wild life in Canada and this country as any other citizen of the United States. He is Dr. William T. Hornaday, for many years the head of the Zoological Park in New York. He has traveled extensively in this and other countries and has an international reputation as an expert and writer on wild life. Both by his writings and his influence he has greatly aided legislation such as this bill contains. The telegram is as follows:

STAMFORD, CONN., February 8, 1929.

Hon. SCHUYLER MERRITT,

House of Representatives:

On behalf of progressive conservation, I beg you to oppose all amendments that may be offered to the Andresen-Norbeck bill as unnecessary and dangerous. As it stands, the bill is perfect, and with both the birds and the sanctuaries it is a case of now or never.

WILLIAM T. HORNADAY.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no other requests for time.

Mr. AYRES. I have not.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate is exhausted, and the Clerk will read the bill. Without objection, the Clerk will read the committee amendment in lieu of the bill.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the committee automatically rises and reports the bill to the House.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that, pursuant to the rule, the committee had had under consideration the bill (S. 1271) for the protection of migratory game birds, and reported the same back with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. AYRES) there were 219 ayes and 0 noes.

On motion of Mr. HAUGEN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS ON THE BILL

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SANCTUARIES FOR THE PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted Members of Congress to extend their remarks in the RECORD I desire to avail myself of that opportunity and to express my thought upon the bill establishing a sanctuary to protect migratory birds. The measure as amended and passed by the House provides a real refuge for the protection and conservation of bird life.

Bird life has been ruthlessly slaughtered by both wanton selfishness and careless attention to this species of fowl which means so much to the food life of man. The bird not only means a food supply but the habits of the bird provide destruction of enemies to crop and vegetable life.

Nature intended that in the orderly carrying out of its laws in a systematic manner all animal life should exist; some for food of other animals; some to destroy insects and other species of life which menace plant, vegetable, and timber life; all being important elements in the food growth for the success and life of the people.

Under the provisions of the bill, land and water can be acquired over a period of 10 years; sanctuaries are created in all of the States desiring to come within the provisions of the act, such States cooperating with the Federal Government in the enforcement of the law.

In my opinion, such cooperation between States and Federal Government is most important, because to make a law fully effective its provisions should be fully appreciated in each State and such provisions should be strictly observed in conformity with the act.

The bill offers hope to the sportsman who believes in protecting wild life not only for the pleasure and recreation he will procure in the hunt during the proper hunting season, but also because the measure means the curtailing of destructive waste.

Actual protection is offered bird life in its necessary flight from one locality to another; a resting and nesting home where the bird is at least temporarily safe is provided.

The bill as passed provides \$75,000 the first year, \$200,000 the second year, \$600,000 the third year, and \$1,000,000 annually for each year thereafter for a period of seven years. This expenditure, if handled properly and systematically, can increase the species of wild-bird life enormously, and the provisions are extended to all the States upon a successful cooperative plan.

Under the provisions of the measure, the Secretary of the Interior is made a member of the Migratory Bird Conservatory Commission. This is a very proper feature because remaining public land, Indian reservations, national parks, national monuments, and other Government reservations of land and water are under the supervision of this Government department. The Secretary of Agriculture should also be added to the commission; his department having under control the national forests of our country. The forests should be the home of much of our bird life; there the birds can rest and raise their young; in a broader sense of the word "sanctuary," the forests should be closed completely to the hunter. Only hunting for the destruction of predatory animals should be allowed in the forests.

Other principal features of the bill are explained in an article which appeared in the Sunday Star, February 10, 1929, and which is entitled "House Passes Bill Protecting Birds," and from which I quote:

OTHER FACTORS INVOLVED

Secretary Jardine of the Department of Agriculture emphasizes that the acquisition of areas suitable for refuges, although primarily intended to increase the numbers of wild fowl, really involve a number of other important factors of definite advantage to the public. It is a serious mistake, he said, to believe that all drainage of water or marsh areas is a public benefit, because actual experience has shown in numerous instances that drainage has resulted in the destruction of water areas which have very profitable uses, and have left instead land of little or no agricultural value.

Under proper conditions, Secretary Jardine points out, many lakes, ponds, swamps, and marsh areas will yield distinctly larger returns financially and otherwise than would the same areas drained for agricultural purposes. The development and utilization of all available products of such areas is termed "water farming."

In addition to the returns that water and swamp areas may yield in wild fowl, many other benefits may result along the following lines:

First. A valuable supply of food and game fish.

Second. Their annual return in furs from such animals as beavers, muskrats, skunks, and raccoons, which frequent them.

Third. Their production in certain areas of grasses, valuable for forage, or for the manufacture of grass rugs and other commodities, which have developed a profitable industry; also in suitable areas, the production of willow suitable for basketry, wicker furniture, and other purposes.

Fourth. A natural ice supply.

Fifth. Definite help they afford in maintaining the underground water level, which is essential for the production of forests and other vegetation, and for subirrigation of hay and other agricultural lands.

Sixth. Their invaluable function in holding back the run-off of flood waters, and in assisting to prevent excessive erosion and other flood damages. The systematic drainage of shallow lakes and swamp areas along drainage ways will greatly increase the danger of floods and the destruction of life and property. The effect of too extensive drainage deserves careful attention in view of its direct relation to the public welfare.

Seven. Many of the more attractive of such water areas lend themselves admirably to educational uses and assist in interesting the people in outdoor recreation and in the natural resources of plant and animal life, which are so important in supplying commodities, such areas in effect constituting outdoor laboratories for important and varied scientific investigations.

The quotation, in my opinion, is worthy of publicity in showing the greater benefits to be derived from the enactment of the legislation. In the main this class of legislation is wholesome, constructive, and in the interest of all the people. It shows no personal interest in the protection and propagation of game for the few; rather, a very broad view is taken to protect a form of life which adds much to man's food supply and also much in the protection and healthy growth of vegetable and timber life.

The State which I have the honor to represent, New Mexico, has a great variety of bird life, and a real effort is being made to protect this form of life by sanctuaries as proposed by the legislation in question.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 5066. An act extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Francis River at or near St. Francis, Ark.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 5194. An act authorizing Richard H. Klein, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the borough of Liverpool, Perry County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 5378. An act authorizing the Fayette City Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near Fayette City, Fayette County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 14919. An act granting the consent of Congress to the commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mahoning River at or near Cedar Street, Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio;

H. R. 15072. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the reconstruction of the bridge across the Grand Calumet River at Burnham Avenue, in Cook County, Ill.;

H. R. 15084. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River, at or near Reedsdale Street, in the city of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Pa.;

H. R. 15269. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Red River at or near Coushatta, La.;

H. R. 15427. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to lend to the Governor of North Carolina 300 pyramidal tents, complete; 9,000 blankets, olive drab, No. 4; 5,000 pillow

cases; 5,000 canvas cots; 5,000 cotton pillows; 5,000 bed sacks; and 9,000 bed sheets to be used at the encampment of the United Confederate Veterans, to be held at Charlotte, N. C., in June, 1929;

H. R. 15470. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Cumberland River in the vicinity of Harts Ferry, Trusdale County, Tenn.;

H. R. 13484. An act authorizing preliminary examinations of sundry streams with the view to the control of their floods, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13502. An act authorizing the State of Minnesota and the State of Wisconsin to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the St. Croix River at or near Stillwater, Minn.;

H. R. 14146. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River, in the city of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Pa.;

H. R. 14164. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Knoxville, Tenn., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Tennessee River, at or near Henley Street, in Knoxville, Knox County, Tenn.;

H. R. 14451. An act to revise and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the County of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River, at or near McKees Rocks Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania";

H. R. 14460. An act authorizing the Iowa-Nebraska Amortized Free Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River, at or near Sioux City, Iowa;

H. R. 14469. An act granting the consent of Congress to the County of Allegheny, Pa., to construct a bridge across the Youghiogheny River between the Borough of Versailles and the village of Boston, in the Township of Elizabeth, Allegheny County, Pa.; and

H. R. 14481. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Chicago South Shore & South Bend Railroad, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Grand Calumet River, at East Chicago, Ind.

NORTHERN PACIFIC LAND GRANT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Joint Resolution 398, to extend the period of time in which the Secretary of the Interior shall withhold his approval of the adjustment of Northern Pacific land grants, and for other purposes, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) to extend the period of time in which the Secretary of the Interior shall withhold his approval of the adjustment of Northern Pacific land grants, and for other purposes

Resolved, etc., That the first section of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to withhold his approval of the adjustment of the Northern Pacific land grants, and for other purposes," approved June 5, 1924, as amended by joint resolutions approved March 3, 1927, and May 28, 1928, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1929" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1930."

SEC. 2. The present members of the joint committee created by section 3 of such joint resolution approved June 5, 1924, as amended, if reelected to the Seventy-first Congress, shall continue to serve, notwithstanding the expiration of the Seventieth Congress, until the end of the first regular session of the Seventy-first Congress, at which time such joint committee shall cease to exist. In case a vacancy occurs in such joint committee by reason of the retirement from Congress on March 4, 1929, of any Member of the House of Representatives, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall, before the expiration of the Seventieth Congress, appoint a Member of the House to fill such vacancy.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution states its purpose. It was introduced by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON], chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands. If there are any questions about the resolution, I should be glad to yield to the gentleman to explain. If not, and there is no desire for debate, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

CELEBRATION OF CANALIZING THE OHIO RIVER

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Rules I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 51, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House Concurrent Resolution 51, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 51

Whereas the completion of the canalizing of the Ohio River from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Cairo, Ill., represents an achievement of great importance in the development of the inland waterways of the United States; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has by legislation contributed to the realization of this project; and

Whereas a celebration commemorating the accomplishment of the great improvement is to be held October 15 to 20, 1929, at which officials of the United States and of the States adjoining the Ohio River will attend; and

Whereas it is fitting that the Congress of the United States be represented at such celebration: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a committee consisting of three Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and three Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall represent the Congress of the United States at the celebration of the completion of the canalizing of the Ohio River from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Cairo, Ill., to be held October 15 to 20, 1929. The members of such committee shall be paid their actual expenses, one-half out of the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice that the report of the Committee on Rules states that this is a privileged report from the Committee on Rules. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to have it considered. Of course, it is not a privileged report. If it were privileged, unanimous consent would not be necessary to get it considered. I am wondering whether the gentleman from Indiana concedes that it is not.

Mr. SNELL. He does, or he would not have asked unanimous consent.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Speaker, evidently it was so regarded, otherwise I would not have submitted a request for unanimous consent for its consideration.

Mr. MAPES. The committee evidently did not so regard it when it made the report, because it stated in its report that it was a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps I am the one who is in error in that respect. We did understand that this is not a privileged report, but I had consulted with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL], the chairman of the Committee on Accounts, and this was such a small matter that we thought we would put it all through in one resolution and that there would be no objection to it at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I particularly request the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON]. I rise to say a word or two concerning the matter that has just been discussed in the colloquy between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL]. It is true that there is a precedent holding that a concurrent resolution very similar to the one presented by the gentleman from Indiana is not privileged. That is a decision made by Mr. Speaker Clark, though I do not now remember the date of it. I have had occasion recently to examine it. It is my opinion that upon a more complete examination than was then given to that question, upon a fuller reasoning, some occupant of the chair in the future will probably feel constrained to overrule that precedent.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I can see no real distinction, so far as reasoning is concerned, between the privilege of a concurrent resolution creating a joint committee, and a simple

House resolution creating a House committee. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this resolution is not privileged for two reasons. One is based upon the precedent of Mr. Speaker Clark that it does not relate to matters pertaining to the rules, joint rules, or order of business; and, further, it makes an appropriation out of the contingent fund of the House, over which the Committee on Accounts has exclusive jurisdiction.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. There is no question about that latter part destroying the privileged character of the resolution, but—

Mr. MAPES. For the two reasons that resolution is not privileged.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes. I did not have that latter part in mind. Of course, that precedent is well fixed and grounded in reason, but what I had in mind was holding it non-privileged simply because it is to create or initiate a joint committee, which may eventually prove more important.

Mr. MAPES. Of course, that point is not being argued now, and the gentleman is merely stating his own opinion about it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course that is so.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WAINWRIGHT, for Monday, February 11, on account of urgent business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, February 11, 1929, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Monday, February 11, 1929, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

(10 a. m. and 2 p. m.)

Tariff hearings as follows:

SCHEDULES

Silk and silk goods, February 11, 12.
Papers and books, February 13, 14.
Sundries, February 15, 18, 19.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

Second deficiency appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS

(10.30 a. m.)

Authorizing the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia and the construction thereon of two modern, high-temperature incinerators for the destruction of combustible refuse (H. R. 16700).

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1

(10 a. m.)

Authorizing the Commissioner of Prohibition to pay for information concerning violations of the narcotic laws of the United States (H. R. 16874).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

815. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the United States Tariff Commission for the fiscal year 1929 in the amount of \$4,000, and a draft of proposed legislation increasing the limitation of \$562,470 for personal services in the District of Columbia contained in the independent offices appropriation act for the fiscal year 1929 to \$629,000 (H. Doc. No. 568); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

816. A letter from the secretary of National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting report of its activities during the year 1928; to the Committee on the Library.

817. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, for Fort Donelson National Military Park, Tenn., amounting to \$45,000 (H. Doc. No. 569); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 312. A resolution providing for the consideration of S. J. Res. 182, a joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the storm and flood stricken areas of southeastern United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2446). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3590. An act to amend section 110 of the Judicial Code; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2448). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KELLY: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. S. 3281. An act to provide a shorter workday on Saturday for postal employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 2449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KIESS: Committee on Insular Affairs. H. R. 16877. A bill providing for the biennial appointment of a board of visitors to inspect and report upon the government and conditions in the Philippine Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 2450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KIESS: Committee on Insular Affairs. S. J. Res. 110. A joint resolution to provide for annexing certain islands of the Samoan group to the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2451). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KIESS: Committee on Insular Affairs. H. R. 16881. A bill to approve, ratify, and confirm an act of the Philippine Legislature entitled "An act amending the corporation law, Act No. 1459, as amended, and for other purposes," enacted November 8, 1928, approved by the Governor General of the Philippine Islands December 3, 1928; without amendment (Rept. No. 2452). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KELLY: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 16305. A bill for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 17003) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands to Charles Beecher Scott; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GREGORY: A bill (H. R. 17004) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Eggners Ferry, Ky.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17005) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Canton, Ky.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17006) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Smithland, Ky.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17007) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Hickman, Ky.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17008) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near the mouth of Clarks River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 17009) to authorize appropriations for expenses of military tribunals, retiring boards, boards of investigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 17010) to amend the merchant marine act of 1928; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LARSEN: A bill (H. R. 17011) to increase the penalties provided for violations of certain antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17012) to provide for an increased penalty in the case of violations of certain antitrust laws by directors, officers, or agents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 17013) to erect a monument, tablets, and markers to mark the battles at Cumberland Gap and as memorials to the Federal and Confederate soldiers who were killed there, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: A resolution (H. Res. 312) providing for the consideration of S. J. Res. 182, for the relief of farmers in the storm and flood stricken areas of southeastern United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: Resolution (H. Res. 313) requesting information from the Federal Reserve Board; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, requesting the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the establishment of a United States Veterans' Bureau general hospital within the State of Indiana for honorably discharged ex-service men of that area; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 17014) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Durant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 17015) granting an increase of pension to Laura G. Chipman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 17016) granting an increase of pension to Candace J. Carr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 17017) to authorize the President to present the distinguished flying cross to Capt. Benjamin Mendez; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA: A bill (H. R. 17018) for the relief of Ernst Lueger; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 17019) granting a pension to Fannie Valentine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9961. By Mr. ARENTZ: Resolutions adopted at the tenth annual meeting of the Nevada State Farm Bureau, January 23, 1929; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9962. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of New York State League of Fish, Game, and Forest Clubs, urging enactment of legislation that will convey outright or for nominal consideration the tract of land located at Camp Upton, Long Island, to the government of New York State in the conservation department, to be developed into a fish and game refuge of great value to future generations through the system now operative under the New York State Conservation Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9963. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of the California Development Association, urging the passage of legislation providing the Department of Agriculture with a sufficient appropriation to prosecute investigations on poultry problems; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9964. Also, petition of the California Development Association, urging an appropriation for the United States Department of Agriculture of at least \$10,000 per annum to employ and equip entomologists to study the lima pod borer, wireworm, and other insects which affect the bean plant; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9965. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of Martin Music Co., Los Angeles, Calif., opposing House bill 13452, which provides for an increase of copyright royalties on phonograph records; to the Committee on Patents.

9966. Also, petition of Orange County Council, American Legion, Anaheim, Calif., urging additional hospital facilities for southern California; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9967. Also, petition of Santa Ana Chamber of Commerce, Santa Ana, Calif., urging additional hospital facilities for California; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

9968. Also, petition of Isaak Walton League of America, Los Angeles Chapter, No. 11, in support of the Norbeck game refuge bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9969. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of 44 members of the First Baptist Church, Bad Axe, Mich.; 53 members of the Methodist Episcopal Church of district including Pinnebog, Chandler, and Caseville, Mich.; 19 members of the Evangelical Church of Greenwood Township, Mich.; 44 members of the Emanuel Evangelical Church, of Brown City, Mich.; 69 mem-

bers of the Kilmanagh Evangelical Church, of Kilmanagh, Mich.; 53 members of the Elkton Methodist Episcopal Church, Elkton, Mich.; 75 members of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, Lapeer, Mich.; and 22 members of the Evangelical Church, Sebewaing, Mich., urging favorable action on the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9970. By Mr. CURRY: Petition of residents of the third California district, protesting against the enactment of the Lankford Sunday bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9971. By Mr. DAVENPORT: Petition of 188 signed members of the Walcott Memorial Church, New York Mills, N. Y., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9972. Also, petition of members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, New York Mills, N. Y., representing 250, urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9973. Also, petition of 88 members of the Salem Welsh Congregational Church, New York Mills, N. Y., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9974. By Mr. EVANS of California: Petition of 29 citizens of the Monte Vista Grove Presbyterian Ministerial Homes, Pasadena, Calif., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9975. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of chamber of commerce, Enid, Okla., in support of House bill 16346; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9976. Also, petition of the board of directors of the National Knitted Outerwear Association, urging a general tariff revision at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9977. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, in support of House bill 450; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9978. By Mr. HARRISON: Petition of seven citizens of Woodstock, Va., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9979. By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of 63 citizens of Newberg and vicinity, Oreg., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9980. By Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska: Petition submitted by Amelia Glasner, of Clarkson, Nebr., and 39 others, protesting against any change in the tariff on hides and leather used in the manufacture of shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9981. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Robert F. Riley, cashier of the First National Bank of Teague, Tex., favoring a tariff on hides, canned meats, and jute; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9982. By Mr. KADING: Petition of 125 members of the First Presbyterian Church, Lodi, Wis., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9983. Also, petition of 300 members of Reformed Church, Sheboygan, Wis., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9984. Also, petition of 364 members of Reformed R. C. A. Church, Sheboygan, Wis., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9985. Also, petition of 200 members of the Presbyterian Church, Kilbourn, Wis., urging the enactment of legislation to

protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9986. Also, petition of 150 members of Christian Reformed Church, Ostburg, Wis., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9987. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union (85 members), of Ripon, Wis., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9988. Also, petition of 101 members of the Salem Presbyterian Church, Oshkosh, Wis., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9989. Also, joint resolution of the Wisconsin Legislature, relating to more adequate protection for the farmers of this State who grow sugar beets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9990. Also, petition of 800 members of the Christ Lutheran Church, Oshkosh, Wis., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9991. By Mr. LANKFORD: Petition of 71 members of Methodist Church, Brenton and New Paris, Ind., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9992. Also, petition of 39 members of United Brethren Church, Warsaw, Ind., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9993. Also, petition of the Kiwanis Club of Warsaw, Ind.; the Warsaw Reading Club, 40 active members; and seven citizens of Warsaw, endorsing the Lankford Sunday rest bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9994. Also, petition of the pastor and 700 members of the Hanes Institutional Church, Winston-Salem, N. C., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9995. Also, petition of the pastor and 95 members of the Mount Pleasant Church, Winston-Salem, N. C., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9996. Also, petition of the pastor and 558 members of the Goler Memorial A. M. E. Zion Church, Winston-Salem, N. C., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9997. Also, petition of the pastors of New Bethel Baptist, Mineral Springs Baptist, First Baptist, and Waughton Baptist Churches of Winston-Salem, N. C., totaling 2,811 members, urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9998. Also, petition of 60 members of the First Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

9999. Also, petition of Bishop John W. Wood, sixth Episcopal district, the A. M. Zion Conference, with a membership of 30,000, urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day

of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10000. Also, petition of the pastor and 200 members of the West End Church, Winston-Salem, N. C., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10001. Also, petition of the pastor and 1,150 members of the West End Methodist Church, Winston-Salem, N. C., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10002. Also, petition of the pastor and 32 members of the United Holiness Church of America, Winston-Salem, N. C., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10003. Also, petition of the pastor and 153 members of the Grace Presbyterian Church, of Winston-Salem, N. C., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10004. Also, petition of the pastors, with a membership of 1,075, of four Christian Churches in Winston-Salem, N. C., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10005. Also, petition of 31 citizens of Winston-Salem, N. C., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10006. Also, petition of the Lott Carey Baptist Foreign Missionary Convention of America, with a membership of 50,000, in session at Winston-Salem, N. C., on the 2d day of September, 1928, urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford Sunday rest bill for the District of Columbia, or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10007. Also, petition of the Ministers Alliance, with a membership of 10,000, in session at High Point, N. C., and bearing the signatures of the president, S. L. Parham, and secretary, Doctor Ashe, urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10008. Also, petition of the West Durham Baptist Church, Durham, N. C., with 804 members present, urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford Sunday rest bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10009. Also, petition of the Ministers' Alliance, with a membership of 11,000, bearing the signatures of the president, A. D. Avery, and the secretary, T. H. Halrston, in session at Greensboro, N. C., July, 1928, urging the enactment of legislation as provided in the Lankford Sunday rest bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10010. Also, petition of the Evangelical Holiness and Missionary Association, in session at Winston-Salem, N. C., with 500 present, unanimously urging you on behalf of the enactment of legislation to protect the people of our Nation's Capital, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10011. Also, petition of principal, faculty, and students of the high school, High Point, N. C., with 1,219 of the student body of 1,238 present, urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10012. Also, petition of the Canal Furniture Co., High Point, N. C., and bearing the signature of the president, W. A. Carroll, numbering 2,000, on behalf of the passage of the Lankford Sunday rest bill for the District of Columbia, or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10013. Also, petition of the members of Waughtown Baptist Church, located at Winston-Salem, N. C., with 139 members

present, on behalf of the passage of the Lankford Sunday rest bill for the District of Columbia, or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10014. Also, petition of M. Ernest Welch, a realtor of State City, N. C., on behalf of the passage of the Lankford Sunday rest bill for the District of Columbia or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10015. Also, petition of the First Presbyterian Church, High Point, N. C., with 500 members present, petitioning you on behalf of the passage of the Lankford Sunday rest bill for the District of Columbia or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10016. Also, petition of the Duke Memorial Church, Durham, N. C., with 1,900 present, petitioning you on behalf of the passage of the Lankford Sunday rest bill for the District of Columbia or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10017. Also, petition of the Frehsale-Highland Charge, Rev. E. M. Jones, pastor, with 1,000 members present, on behalf of the passage of the Lankford Sunday rest bill for the District of Columbia (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10018. Also, petition of 45 members of Ridgedale Presbyterian Church, South Bend, Ind., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10019. Also, petition of the Christian Church, Graham City, N. C., with 67 members present, petitioning you in behalf of the passage of the Lankford Sunday rest bill for the District of Columbia (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10020. Also, petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church, High Point, N. C., with 1,000 members present, urging the enactment into law of the Lankford Sunday rest bill for the District of Columbia (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10021. Also, petition of the members of First Baptist Church, of High Point, N. C., with 1,170 members present, petitioning you on behalf of the passage of the Lankford Sunday rest bill for the District of Columbia (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10022. Also, petition of the members of the Christian Church, at High Point, N. C., and submitted by Rev. L. N. McFarland, superintendent of North Carolina Friends, with 1,000 present, urging your help on behalf of the passage of the Lankford Sunday rest bill for the District of Columbia or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10023. Also, petition of the Park Place Methodist Episcopal Church, Greensboro, N. C., with a membership of 590, petitioning you in behalf of the passage of the Lankford Sunday rest bill for the District of Columbia or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10024. Also, petition of 31 members of the First Baptist Sunday School, Washington, D. C., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10025. Also, petition of 39 members of the Presbyterian Church, Warsaw, Ind., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10026. Also, petition of 33 members of Christian Church, Warsaw, Ind., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10027. Also, petition of 18 members of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, of Warsaw, Ind., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10028. Also, petition of First Church of Christ Scientist, Warsaw, Ind., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10029. Also, petition of 190 citizens of Warsaw, Ind., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's

Capitol in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10030. Also, petition of 31 members of the North Winona Church of the Brethren, Winona Lake, Ind., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10031. Also, petition of 58 members of Methodist Church of Nappanee, Ind., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10032. Also, petition of 13 members of Methodist Church at Mentone, Ind., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10033. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Luckenbach Steamship Co., protesting against Senate bill 1781, urging change to include coastwise steamers in its application, as exclusion of barges is a discrimination against steamer coastal transportation; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

10034. Also, petition of John Tracy, and Thomas J. Howard, New York City, protesting against Senate bill 1781, urging change to include coastwise steamers in its application, as exclusion of barges is a discrimination against steamer coastal transportation; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

10035. Also, petition of New York Band Instrument Co. (Inc.), protesting against passage of House bill 13452, as bringing serious consequences adversely affecting the entire talking-machine industry; to the Committee on Patents.

10036. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the New York Band Instrument Co. (Inc.), opposing the passage of House bill 13452; to the Committee on Patents.

10037. Also, petition of Thomas J. Howard, John Tracy, and the Luckenbach Steamship Co. of New York, opposing the passage of Senate bill 1781; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

10038. Also, petition of the New York State Fish, Game, and Forest League, favoring the passage of the Norbeck game refuge bill (S. 1271); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10039. Also, petition of the New York State Fish, Game, and Forest League, favoring the development of Camp Upton, Long Island, N. Y., into a fish and game refuge; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10040. Also, petition of the National Knitted Outerwear Association, New York City, opposing any partial revision which will unbalance the business outlook, substitute uncertainty for confidence, and result in postponing the general revision so necessary at this time; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10041. By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: Resolution adopted by the board of directors of the National Outerwear Association, January 18, 1929, urging an early extra session of Congress for the purpose of a general revision of the tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10042. By Mr. PORTER: Petition of 33 citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10043. Also, petition of 27 citizens of the thirty-second district of Pennsylvania, urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford Sunday rest bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10044. Also, petition of 30 citizens of the thirty-second congressional district of Pennsylvania, urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10045. Also, petition of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Allegheny County, Pa., with about 1,000 members, urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10046. Also, petition of 78 citizens of Allegheny and Washington Counties, Pa., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10047. By Mr. SCHAFER: Petition of 150 members of Wauwatosa Evangelical Church, Wauwatosa, Wis., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10048. Also, petition of 325 members of United Presbyterian Church, West Allis, Wis., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10049. Also, petition of 52 members of Greenfield Presbyterian Church of West Allis, Wis., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10050. Also, petition of 65 members of the Willard Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Milwaukee, Wis., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10051. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of C. E. Grasser, of Epping, N. Dak., and 213 others, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10052. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Armstrong and Jefferson Counties, Pa., opposed to any change in the present tariff on hides and leather used in the manufacture of shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10053. By Mr. THOMPSON: Memorial of 35 citizens of Montpelier, Ohio, opposing any change in the present tariff on hides and leather used in the manufacture of shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10054. By Mr. WHITEHEAD: Petition of 34 citizens of Charlotte County, Va., requesting the enactment of House bill 14144, proposing to grant equipment allowance to third-class postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10055. By Mr. WHITTINGTON: Petition of A. B. Wiggins, president of board of supervisors of Bolivar County, Miss., for amendment of migratory game law to extend open season on ducks and geese; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10056. Also, petition of W. L. Hines and others, for legislation in aid of drainage district; to the Committee on Reclamation and Irrigation.

10057. Also, petition of M. Black and others, with relation to tariff on hides and leather; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10058. By Mr. WINTER: Petition of Veteran Presbyterian Church, representing a membership of 75, at Veteran, Wyo., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10059. Also, petition of 15 members of the Community House, Veteran, Wyo., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10060. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Westmoreland County Rural Letter Carriers' Association, favoring passage of Dale-Lehbach retirement bill; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

10061. Also, petition of Izaak Walton League of America, Pittsburgh Chapter, No. 13, of Pennsylvania, favoring passage of Norbeck bird conservation bill (S. 1271; H. R. 5457); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10062. Also, petition of Audubon Society of Western Pennsylvania, Alva K. Held, secretary, favoring passage of Norbeck game refuge bill (S. 1271); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10063. Also, petition of Scranton Bird Club, favoring passage of Norbeck-Andresen game refuge bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10064. Also, petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring passage of Norbeck bird conservation bill (S. 1271); to the Committee on Agriculture.